IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FREDERICK H. SHULL, JR., Petitioner,

vs.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE WILLIAM D. KEPHART, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

THE ROSEMAN CONTRACT, VIA ROSEMAN UNIVERSITY, Real Party in Interest.

No. 78432

FILED

APR 1 8 2019



ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original, pro se petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges the district court's dismissal, purportedly without prejudice, of petitioner's complaint for declaratory relief in a contract and First Amendment matter.

Having considered the petition, we deny relief. Writs of mandamus and prohibition are available only when there is no plain, adequate, and speedy legal remedy. See NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330. Here, petitioner can appeal from an adverse final judgment of the district court, which constitutes an adequate legal remedy. Pan v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 120 Nev. 222, 224, 88 P.3d 840, 841 (2004) ("[T]he right to appeal is generally an adequate legal remedy that precludes writ relief."); see NRAP 3A(b)(1); Bergenfield v. BAC Home Loans Servicing, 131 Nev. 683, 354 P.3d 1282 (2015) (explaining the options when a district court dismisses with

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

(O) 1947A

leave to amend). Moreover, it is petitioner's burden to demonstrate that writ relief is warranted, and here, petitioner failed to submit any parts of the record for our review and failed to include a certificate of service of the petition on respondents and real party in interest. NRAP 21(a)(1) and (4); Pan, 120 Nev. at 228, 88 P.3d at 844. Accordingly, we decline to intervene, and we

ORDER the petition DENIED.

C.J.

Gibbons

Pickering

Pickering J.

J. Hardesty

Hon. William D. Kephart, District Judge cc: Frederick H. Shull, Jr. Eighth District Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

